

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

MARY BERGER-ROYALS,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) No. 11 C 4678
)
THOMAS J. DART, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM ORDER

During the May 17 status hearing in this action, this Court spoke of the inappropriateness of a motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint, for the amendment had made no change whatever in the allegations as to the movants, who had simply consented to the original Complaint. As a result, defense counsel acceded to the denial without prejudice of the motion to dismiss, and this Court so orders.

This Court had previously deferred ruling on plaintiff's motion to compel certain discovery pending the determination of the motion to dismiss. Although that subject was not discussed during the status hearing, the parties' prior filings point the way toward resolution of that motion in this manner:

1. Because the two defendants newly named in the Amended Complaint in substitution for "Officer John Doe I" and "Officer John Doe II" obviously need not respond to any discovery requests until they have appeared.
 2. Based on defense counsel's representation that a

reorganization of correctional officers' files has taken place to separate purely personal information (such as an officer's place of residence) from disciplinary information, plaintiff's motion to compel is granted as to the latter but not the former.

3. Defendants are also ordered to comply with plaintiff's request for the production of specific General Orders of the Sheriff's Office.

This memorandum order is intended to resolve all disputed issues in connection with plaintiff's motion to compel (Dkt. 30). If any items remain open, however, either or both parties should identify them and request rulings.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: May 22, 2012